

complexity of the underlying case; whether the case requires a factual investigation and a plaintiff's ability to carry out that factual investigation; and whether credibility determinations are involved that may require the experience of one trained in the presentation of evidence and cross-examination. Id. at 156.

Plaintiff has failed to sufficiently address the merits of his case and does not address the likelihood of success of his claims. While Plaintiff Aruanno does address his lack of legal knowledge and the complexities of the underlying case, his assertions do not rise to the level necessary for the appointment of pro bono counsel. Plaintiff asserts only general claims in his application and does not provide specific facts or allegations. Plaintiff fails to adequately address the threshold requirement for pro bono counsel, namely that his case "has arguable merit in fact and law." Tabron, 6 F.3d at 155. Because Plaintiff is unable to satisfy this burden, the Court must deny his application.

II. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the application by Plaintiff Joseph Aruanno, for appointment of pro bono counsel is **denied**. An appropriate Order accompanies this Opinion.

S/ Dennis M. Cavanaugh
Dennis M. Cavanaugh, U.S.D.J.

Date: January 3, 2008
Original: Clerk's Office
cc: All Counsel of Record
The Honorable Mark Falk, U.S.M.J.
File